

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, 16-19, 21-23 and 26-29 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 11 and 21 are amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Telephonic Interview:

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the telephonic interviews on October 11, 2011 and October 20, 2011. The Examiner has indicated in those interviews that the claim amendments included above will overcome the cited art and place the claims in condition for allowance. The Examiner agreed to enter the amendments after final. Applicant therefore respectfully submits the amendments included above and requests a notice of allowance of all pending claims.

Double Patenting Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, 16-19, 21-23 and 26-29 under the judiciary created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent 6,643,650. A terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejection has been filed along with the previous response. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the double patenting rejection of claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, 16-19, 21-23 and 26-29.

Section 102(e) rejections:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 6-13, 16-23 and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Humpleman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,546,419) (hereinafter "Humpleman"). As discussed with the Examiner in the telephonic interviews of October 11, 2011 and October 20, 2011, the amendments included above overcome the cited art. Applicant therefore respectfully requests a notice of allowance with respect to

all pending claims.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 10, 20 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Zintel, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,725,281) (hereinafter “Zintel”). As discussed with the Examiner in the telephonic interviews of October 11, 2011 and October 20, 2011, the amendments included above overcome the cited art. Applicant therefore respectfully requests a notice of allowance with respect to all pending claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-64900/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: October 25, 2011